

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated December 29, 2006, the Examiner rejects Claims 15-26. Applicant amends claims 15, 19 and 23 and respectfully traverses the rejections. Claims 15-26 are now pending in the application. In light of the above the amendments and following arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed.

The Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U. S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,041, 054 issued to Westberg (Westberg). To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements “arranged as in the claim.” *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The Examiner is reminded that the **test for anticipation** is symmetrical to the test for infringement and has been stated as: “That which would literally infringe [a claim] if later in time anticipates if earlier than the date of invention.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Connell v. Sears Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 U.S.P.Q. 1931, 1938 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Furthermore, **missing elements** may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Finally, in order to support an anticipation rejection based on **inherency**, an Examiner must provide factual and technical grounds establishing that the inherent feature necessarily flows from the

teachings of the prior art. *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1990); *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581, 212 U.S.P.Q. 323, 326 (C.C.P.A. 1981) (holding that inherency must flow as a necessary conclusion from the prior art, not simply a possible one).

Claim 15 recites “receiving connection information for a connection from a module in a routing system wherein said connection information is information needed by a module to support said connection.” Westberg does not teach connection information as recited in amended claim. Instead, Westberg teaches a compression method in which an identifier is placed inside a packet instead of the source address and destination address. See Col. 6, lines 4-21. The source and destination addresses are then stored in a look-up table. See Col. 7, lines 10-14. When the identifier is read by a receiving system, the receiving system then looks for addresses using the identifier in the packet. Col. 7, lines 13-17. However, none of this describes connection information that is information needed by a module to support the connection. The “connection information” in Westberg is actual data, i.e. the source and destination address that is transmitted over a connection. Thus, the data cited in Westberg is not connection information as recited in amended claim 15. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be removed and amended claim 15 be allowed.

Claims 16-18 are dependent from claim 15 and allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 15. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests claims 16-18 be allowed.

Amended claim 19 recites a server that performs the method recited in amended claim 15. Therefore, amended claim 19 is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 15. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests amended claim 19 be allowed.

Claims 20-22 are dependent from claim 19. Thus, claims 20-22 are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 19. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that claims 20-22 be allowed.

Amended claim 23 recites an apparatus that performs the method recited in amended claim 15. Therefore, amended claim 23 is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 15. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests amended claim 23 be allowed.

Claims 24-26 are dependent from claim 23. Thus, claims 24-26 are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 23. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that claims 24-26 be allowed

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: February 1, 2007

/william p. wilbar/

William P. Wilbar
Reg. No.: 43,265

Sierra Patent Group
1657 Hwy. 395, Suite 202
Minden, NV 89423
(775) 586-9500